

after the flowering season is over.—CHAS. A. DAVIS, *Alma College, Alma, Mich.*

Cornus Baileyi C. & E. in Oregon.—In the revision of Cornaceæ (Coulter and Evans), under the discussion of the relationship of *C. stolonifera* Michx., *C. pubescens* Nutt., and *C. Baileyi* C. & E.¹ the prediction was made that *C. Baileyi* might be found along the Pacific coast and its ranges, where it had descended from its already known habitat of British America, and that it would be confounded with *C. pubescens*. Such has since proved to be the case. In a package of plants recently received from Messrs. Drake & Dickson, Portland, Oregon, there was found an undoubted specimen of *C. Baileyi* from Castle Rock, Columbia River, Oregon, bearing the date June 1889 as to flowers, the fruit evidently being of later collection. As in the east, *C. Baileyi* has been confused with *C. stolonifera* on account of the presence of some appressed pubescence, so here it had been labeled *C. pubescens*, evidently on account of the rather loosely pubescent under surface of the leaves. But an examination with a lens showed the presence of both appressed and wooly pubescence, such as is found in *C. Baileyi* and not in either of the others. The stone in this specimen is nearly twice as broad as high, is prominently flattened, has the square-shouldered top of typical *C. Baileyi*, and has its rather deeply furrowed edge. This combination of characters can leave no doubt as to the occurrence of *C. Baileyi* on the west coast. It is highly probable that forms may be found not so well defined as this one, and the presence of all three of these nearly related species will give more or less trouble when approaching each other, yet the extreme forms should give no cause for difficulty in determination.—WALTER H. EVANS, *Indianapolis, Ind., Herbarium Eli Lilly & Co.*

NOTE.—A private letter from E. J. Hill, of Englewood, Ills., makes the following statements concerning *C. Baileyi*: "My first note on it was in Sept. 1875, and it was called *C. stolonifera*. But studying this lake shore shrub in other years it seemed *C. sericea*, but the fruit was not colored rightly. It was too ruddy a shrub for *C. paniculata*, and so has remained a source of doubt till your characterization appeared. Noticing them the other day (January) while taking a trip in the Pine Barrens, the color of the canes of the two contrast considerably. When the leaves are off, we get the color to the best advantage. Those of *C. stolonifera* are very bright red and glossy in winter, of a hue almost crimson, while those of *C. Baileyi* are duller, a little of the brick-red cast. I think one could be pretty sure of identity in the winter, from this character alone."

J. M. C.

¹Bot. Gazette, xv. pp. 38 and 88.